

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

### **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,434	06/30/2000	Il Gun Kwon	0465-0715P	9740
2292	7590	09/10/2004	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			KE, PENG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/608,434

Applicant(s)

KWON ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 8-11, 14-17, 19-21 and 53-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 8-11, 14-17, 19-21, and 53-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 5/27/04.

This action is final.

2. Claims 1, 6, 8-11, 14-17, 19-21, and 53-73 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 20, 57, 59, and 70 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 5/27/04, claims 1, 6, 8-11, 14-16, and 19-21 are amended, and claims 53-73 are added.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 73 recites the limitation "claim 73". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Examiner interprets claim 73 to be claim 70.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 6, 8-11, 14-17, 19-21, and 53-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fado et al. (US 5,995,933) in view Berstis et al. (US 5,903,266).

As per independent claim 1, Fado et al. teaches a method of assisting a user to make a connection between a main device and at least one peripheral device, comprising:

displaying a menu on a screen page, the menu including a plurality of menu items, each menu item identifying a different combination of devices to be connected (Fig. 6, item 126, 128, 130, 132); and

displaying, on the same screen page, a guide illustration in response to a user's selection of one of the menu item, the illustration showing how to connect the main device and the at least one of the at least two peripheral devices indicated by the user-selected menu item (Fig 21, items 262 and 264).

However, Fado et al. fails to teach the main device being a digital TV and that it is connected to at least two peripheral devices, wherein each of the two devices generates an audio signal and a video signal.

Berstis et al. teaches the main device being a digital TV (col. 3, lines 35-42) and that it is connected to at least two peripheral devices, wherein each of the two devices generates an audio signal and a video signal (col. 6, lines 32-68).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Berstis' teaching with method of Fado et al. in order to provide the user with an interactive guide for connecting a TV, a stereo, and computer monitor.

As per claim 6, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 8, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 6. Fado further teaches the method wherein the graphical illustration show the electrical connections in a highlighted form

(fig 13, col. 10, lines 40-57; It is inherent when the reference are combined the main device would be the digital TB along with at least two peripheral devices)

As per claim 9, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 8. Fado further teaches the method wherein the highlighted form is a color which differs from a remainder of the graphical illustration (fig 13, col. 10, lines 40-57).

As per claim 10, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 6. Fado further teaches the method wherein the displaying step, the graphical illustration depicts connection terminals of each of the digital TV and the at least two peripheral devices, and depicts the electrical connections between the connection terminals of the at least two devices depending on the user input (fig 13, col. 10, lines 40-57).

As per claim 11, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 6. Berstis further teaches the method wherein the displaying step displays the graphical illustration on the display screen of the digital TV (col. 6, lines 32-68).

As per claim 14, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 6. Fado further teacher the method comprising:

displaying a menu having a plurality of menu items, each menu item identifying a different combination of devices to be connected associated (Fig. 6, item 126, 128, 130, 132);  
and

receiving a the user input being a selection of one of the menu items, wherein the step of displaying the graphical illustration displays the electrical connections of the devices identified by the user-selected menu item (fig 13, col. 10, lines 40-57).

As per claim 15, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 14. Fado further teaches the method wherein each menu item is displayed as an icon (Fig. 5, item 126, 128, 130, 132).

As per claim 16, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 14. Fado further teaches the method wherein the menu and the graphical illustration are displayed on the same screen page of the display screen (Fig. 5, item 126, 128, 130, 132).

As per claim 17, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 14. Berstis further teaches the method wherein the receiving step includes receiving signals from an input device providing instructions on moving a cursor displayed on the display screen onto one of the menu items (col. 5, lines 46-55).

As per claim 19, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 6. Berstis further teaches wherein each of the at least two peripheral devices generates a video signal and an audio signal (col. 3, lines 27-41).

As per claim 20, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 21, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 20, Berstis further teaches wherein the at least two peripheral devices include at least two of the following: a broadcast antenna, a cable box, a disk drive, speakers, a mouse, a printer, a DVD player, and a satellite receiver. (col. 6, lines 32-68),

As per claim 53, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 21. Berstis further teaches wherein the main device is a TV, a set top box, or a computer (col. 3, lines 35-42).

As per claim 54, which is dependent on claim 20, it is of the same scope as claim 10. (see rejection above)

As per claim 55, Fado and Berstis teach the method of claim 1. Berstis further teaches the method wherein in the step of displaying, the guide illustration depicts wire connections between terminals of the digital TV and the at least one of the at least two peripheral devices (col. 6, lines 32-68).

As per claim 56, which is dependent on claim 6, it is of the same scope as claim 10. (see rejection above)

As per claim 57, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 58, which is dependent on claim 57, it is of the same scope as claim 10. (see rejection above)

As per claim 59, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 60, which is dependent on claim 59, it is of the same scope as claim 8. (see rejection above).

As per claim 61, which is dependent on claim 60, it is of the same scope as claim 9. (see rejection above)

As per claim 62, which is dependent on claim 59, it is of the same scope as claim 10. (see rejection above)

As per claim 63, which is dependent on claim 59, it is of the same scope as claim 11. (see rejection above)

As per claim 64, which is dependent on claim 59, it is of the same scope as claim 14. (see rejection above)

As per claim 65, which is dependent on claim 64, it is of the same scope as claim 15. (see rejection above)



As per claim 66, which is dependent on claim 64, it is of the same scope as claim 16. (see rejection above)

As per claim 67, which is dependent on claim 64, it is of the same scope as claim 17. (see rejection above)

As per claim 68, which is dependent on claim 59, it is of the same scope as claim 19. (see rejection above).

As per claim 69, which is dependent on claim 59, it is of the same scope as claim 10. (see rejection above).

As per claim 70, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above)

As per claim 71, which is dependent on claim 70, it is of the same scope as claim 21. (see rejection above).

As per claim 72, which is dependent on claim 71, it is of the same scope as claim 53 (see rejection above).

As per claim 73, which is dependent on claim 70, it is of the same scope as claim 10 (see rejection above)

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 8-11, 14-17, 19-21, and 53-7 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (703) 305-7615. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100